

April 19, 2016

VIA HAND-DELIVERY

Clerk of Court
United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
James A. Byrne U.S. Courthouse
601 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106

RE: Lindsley v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc., et. al., U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, No. 2:16-cv-00941-RBS

Dear Clerk of Court:

I am enclosing an original and one copy of the Complaint in the above-referenced case. Please file the original, time-stamp the copy and return it to the courier who has been instructed to wait. In addition, I am enclosing a CD containing an electronic version of today's filing along with the relevant cover sheets.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

GOWEN RHOADES WINOGRAD & SILVA, PLLC

New 2. Mul

Mark L. Rhoades

Partner

MLR/mt Enclosures

cc: The Honorable R. Barclay Surrick (via hand-delivery) (with courtesy copy of Complaint) Tiffany Alexander, Esquire (via email) (with copy of Complaint)

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet.

(SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	OF THIS FC	DEFENDANTS			
Margret Lindsley				American Honda Motor Company, Inc., et al. Ada Techbologies, Inc.			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Montgomery County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			, PA	NOTE: IN LAND CO	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Gowen Rhoades Winogra 1420 Walnut Street, Suite 215-496-9002	ad & Silva PLLC			Attorneys (If Known) Campbell Campbe 1205 Westlakes Dr 610-964-1900			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)			RINCIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State	FF DEF	Incorporated or Pri	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	■ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2 🗇 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	Γ m «ν" : α . n . α			en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗆 3	Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
CONTRACT		ORTS	FC	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise ■ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	Y	DRFEITURE/PENALTY 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 6 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 10 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 11 Family and Medical Leave Act 10 Other Labor Litigation 11 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	422 Appe	cal 28 USC 158 drawal ISC 157 RTY RIGHTS rrights at emark SECURITY (1395ff) k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI	OTHER STATUTES □ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	moved from 3 tte Court Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	Appellate Court			r District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation	ict
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	Tort - Automobile	Defect IS A CLASS ACTION	N D	EMAND \$			if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY		JUDGE		4		URY DEMAND:	₩ 1c2 □ 140
DATE 4/19/16	U	SGNATURE OF AT	TORNIY	DERECORD	7		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUE	OGE

Case 2:16-cv-00941-RBS Document 5 Filed 04/19/16 Page 3 of 17

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

assignment to appropriate calendar.				
Address of Plaintiff: 302 Penn Oak Road, Flourtown, PA 19031				
Address of Defendant: 1919 Torrance Boulevard, Mail Stop: 500 - 2N -	7A, Torrance, CA 90501-2746			
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Montgomery County, PA	100			
(Use Reverse Side For Ad	(ditional Space)			
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and	d any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?			
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes□ No 🗓			
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No[X]			
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Data Torrainated:			
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:			
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:				
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year	r previously terminated action in this court? Yes□ No█			
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior su				
action in this court?	ne pendang or minim one year premeasily remining			
	Yes□ NoX			
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier nu				
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No□X			
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights	case filed by the same individual?			
4. Is this case a second of successive hardes corpus, social security appeal, or pro-second rights	Yes NoX			
	105— MAE			
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)				
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:			
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts			
2. □ FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury			
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation			
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury			
5. Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury			
	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)			
6. Labor-Management Relations	The state of the s			
7. □ Civil Rights	7. M Products Liability			
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos			
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases			
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)			
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)				
ARBITRATION CERTI				
Mark L. Rhoades , counsel of record do hereby certify				
N Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and be	elief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of			
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;				
Relief other than monetary damages is sought	7			
DATE: 4/19/16	80641			
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#			
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	e has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.			
Ecertify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or w	vithin one year previously terminated action in this court			
except as noted above.				
hate ullelle NV WW VIII.				
Attorney-at-Law	80641 Attorney I.D.#			
onoj at Law	Tittoliley 1.15.17			

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

MARGARET LINDSLEY

CIVIL ACTION

()

	v.	:				
AMERICAN HONDA	MOTOR COMPANY, INC.,	et al., :	NO	. 2:16-cv-000941	-RE	3S
plaintiff sha filing the co side of this designation the plaintiff	ce with the Civil Justice Expe Il complete a Case Manageme mplaint and serve a copy on all form.) In the event that a do that defendant shall, with its and all other parties, a Case Management	nt Track Design defendants. (Se efendant does r first appearance Management Tra	nation Form in all ci- ee § 1:03 of the plan a not agree with the p e, submit to the clerk ack Designation Form	vil cases at the tir set forth on the re laintiff regarding to f court and serv	me overs	of se id on
SELECT O	NE OF THE FOLLOWING	CASE MANA	GEMENT TRACK	S:		
(a) Habeas	Corpus – Cases brought under	28 U.S.C. § 22	241 through § 2255.		()
(b) Social S and Hur	ecurity – Cases requesting rev nan Services denying plaintiff	iew of a decision Social Security	on of the Secretary of Benefits.	f Health	()
(c) Arbitrat	ion - Cases required to be desi	ignated for arbi	tration under Local (Civil Rule 53.2.	()
(d) Asbesto	s – Cases involving claims for	personal injury	y or property damage	e from		

management cases.)

(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.

(X)

04/19/2016	<u> Mark L. Rhoades</u>	Margaret Lindsley
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for
215-496-9002	202-499-1370	mrhoades@gowenrhoades.com

Telephone FAX Number E-Mail Address

(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special

(Civ. 660) 10/02

exposure to asbestos.

GOWEN RHOADES WINOGRAD & SILVA PLLC

Attorney for Plaintiff

BY: MARK L. RHOADES

ATTORNEY I.D. NO: 80641

1420 Walnut Street

Suite 1320

Philadelphia, PA 19102 Phone: 215-496-9002 Fax: 202-499-1370

mrhoades@gowenrhoades.com

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MARGARET LINDSLEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR COMPANY, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION

DOCKET NO.: 2:16-cv- 00941-RBS

Jury Trial Demanded

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Margaret Lindsley ("Lindsley or "Plaintiff"), by and through her undersigned attorneys, files this Complaint and alleges as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 1. On the evening of December 31, 2013, Lindsley was preparing to celebrate New Year's Eve with her friends. However, unfortunately for her, given the actions and inactions of the Defendants, Lindsley spent the night at the hospital as the victim of a defective design of her 2013 Honda CRV.
- 2. Although she had put the transmission of her Honda CRV into the "Park" position, the gear selection lever on the automatic transmission slipped out of "Park" when she attempted to exit while parked at her friend's house.

- 3. Because the transmission slipped out of "Park", Lindsley was pulled under the car as she was exiting the driver's side door, causing the car to roll over her as she became trapped between the open car door and the frame of the vehicle. The left front tire of the vehicle rolled over her ankle causing a severe break of her ankle and other injuries to her body. She also observed the wheel narrowly miss rolling over her head as the tire passed inches from her face.
- 4. Although the gear selection lever was placed into the "Park" position and is purportedly designed not to move from the "Park" position unless the driver's foot depresses the brake, the gear selection did move from the "Park" position without Lindsley depressing the brake due to a defect in the manufacture and design of the Brake Transmission Shift Interlock.
- 5. As a result of this defect, the vehicle began to roll, running over her and causing serious and permanent injury.
- 6. With this action, Lindsley seeks to hold the Defendants accountable for their conduct and to seek redress for her significant personal injuries.

PARTIES

- 7. Plaintiff, Margaret Lindsley, is a female adult individual residing at 309 Penn Oak Road, Flourtown, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania 19031. Lindsley is currently 81 years old.
- 8. Defendant, American Honda Motor Co. Inc. ("Honda"), is a California corporation with its national headquarters at 1919 Torrance Blvd., Torrance, California.
 - 9. Honda does business within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
 - 10. Honda is a subsidiary of Honda Motor Co., Ltd., a Japanese corporation.
- 11. Defendant, Ada Technologies, Inc. ("Ada Technologies"), is an Ohio corporation with its headquarters at 805 East North Avenue, Ada, Ohio. Upon information and belief, Ada

conducts business within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and its products are sold in Pennsylvania.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 12. This case was commenced by Plaintiff by the filing of a Writ of Summons in the Montgomery County Court of Common Pleas on December 29, 2015. On February 26, 2016, Defendant, Honda, filed a Notice of Removal in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 and 1446. Because this civil action is between citizens of different states, and the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, this Court has original jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332.
- 13. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Plaintiff resides in this judicial district and because a substantial part of the acts giving rise to the claims alleged herein occurred in this judicial district.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

- 14. All allegations of the preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
- 15. In 2013, Plaintiff purchased a 2013 Honda CR-V (hereinafter "the CR-V"). The Vehicle Identification Number assigned to the CR-V by Honda is 5J6RM4H57DL005388.
- 16. Unknown to Plaintiff at the time of purchase, her CR-V contained an admitted manufacturing defect in the Brake Transmission Shift Interlock ("the BTS Interlock").
- 17. As stated by Honda in its letter to the National Highway Traffic Safety

 Administration dated April 12, 2013, Honda learned by no later than April 5, 2013, that the BTS

 Interlock on 204,169 Honda vehicles, including Plaintiff's CR-V, had a manufacturing defect.
 - 18. In the letter dated April 12, 2013, Honda admitted the following:

On April 5, 2013 Honda Motor Co., Ltd. (HMC) determined that a non-compliance with the requirements of Section 5.3 of FMVSS 114, Brake Transmission Shift Interlock, exists in the automatic transmission gear selector lever of certain 2012-2013 model year Honda CR-V ... automobiles, and is providing notification to the National Highway Safety Administration in accordance with 49 CFR Part 573 Defect and Noncompliance Reports.

19. In the letter dated April 12, 2013, Honda provided further detail regarding the admitted defect in the BTS Interlock:

Defect description:

Due to a manufacturing error the brake-shift interlock function of the automatic transmission gear selector may not operate properly at low temperatures. If the brake-shift interlock mechanism was manufactured improperly, it will have tight tolerances that are susceptible to increased friction when the parts contract at low temperatures. As a result, at subfreezing temperatures, the first time after an affected brake shift interlock blocking mechanism is operated, it may become slow to return to its proper position per design. Delayed operation of the brake shift interlock blocking mechanism could allow the gear selector to be moved from the Park position without pressing the brake pedal, causing the mechanism to fail to comply with the requirements of Section 5.3 of FMVSS 114.

- 20. On the evening of December 31, 2013, Lindsley had plans to celebrate New Year's Eve with her friends. At approximately 5:30 p.m., Lindsley left her home and drove approximately 10 minutes away to a friend's house in her CR-V. It was the first time that she drove the CR-V that day.
 - 21. It was below freezing when she drove the CR-V on December 31, 2013.
- 22. When she arrived at her friend's house, Lindsley circled around the cul-de-sac and parked in front of her friend's house, with the car pointed in the direction that she would need to travel when she left.
- 23. When she stopped the car in front of her friend's house, she put the automatic transmission in the "Park" position to wait for her friend to exit her house.

- 24. While she was waiting for her friend, Ms. Lindsley exited the vehicle to secure bottles of champagne that had been rolling around in the rear cargo area of the CR-V during the approximate 10-minute drive from her house.
 - 25. At the time she exited the vehicle, the motor was still running.
- 26. As she was exiting the CR-V, the vehicle began to roll backwards down a slight grade on the street outside her friend's house, even though she had placed the gear selection lever in the "Park" position.
- 27. As the CR-V continued to roll backwards, Lindsley was caught between the car door and the frame of the vehicle and violently thrown to the ground and dragged.
- 28. As the CR-V continued to roll backward, Lindsley's left foot and leg were runover by the left front wheel causing a severe break of her ankle and serious abrasions to her foot.
- 29. As the CR-V continued to roll backward, Lindsley's left hand was run-over by the left front wheel causing a severe break to one of the fingers on her left hand.
- 30. As the CR-V continued to roll backward, Lindsley saw the left front wheel pass inches from her face and she was in imminent fear that her head was about to be crushed by the wheel. Fortunately for Lindsley, she was able to crawl away just in time to avoid certain death.
- 31. Ultimately the CR-V came to rest in a creek in the front yard of a neighbor's house after jumping the curb of the cul-de-sac and hitting a cable utility box in the neighbor's yard.

CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT I

NEGLIGENCE

- 32. All allegations of the preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
- 33. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants designed, manufactured, assembled, marketed, advertised, sold, and otherwise supplied into the stream of commerce a product for distribution, sale, or use in this and other states namely the 2013 CR-V.
- 34. At all times relevant hereto, each Defendant individually had a duty to design, manufacture, assemble, sell, and distribute the CR-V in a reasonably safe condition for the respective purposes for which such product was to be used, and for which such product was designed, manufactured, and sold.
- 35. The Defendants breached their duty of due care by their negligent, careless, wanton, willful, and indifferent failure to act, including but not limited to, manufacturing the CR-V with an admitted manufacturing defect in the BTS Interlock.
- 36. The CR-V, at the time it left the Defendants' possession, was defective and unreasonably dangerous for its intended use.
- 37. Defendants' aforesaid actions caused direct and proximate injury and damages to the Plaintiff, including but not limited to pain and suffering, disfigurement, loss of enjoyment of life, emotional distress including the fear of imminent death, past and future medical expenses and general damages in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Honorable Court and in an amount to be determined at trial.

COUNT II

STRICT PRODUCT LIABILITY

- 38. All allegations of the preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
- 39. The Defendants defectively designed and/or improperly manufactured, and then sold the CR-V in a defective and dangerous condition, in that the CR-V failed to protect the Plaintiff from serious injury while utilizing the CR-V in a manner for which it was intended.
- 40. The CR-V was more dangerous than expected by the consumer due to the admitted defect in the BTS Interlock.
- 41. By no later than April 5, 2013, the Defendants determined that a safety related defect existed and advised the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration that it intended to conduct a nationwide recall of affected vehicles including Lindsley's CR-V.
- 42. At the time of Plaintiff's injuries, her CR-V was being used in a reasonable manner that was foreseeable by the Defendants.
- 43. Because of the above-mentioned defects, the Honda CR-V was not fit for the purpose it was intended.
 - 44. Defendants are strictly liable in tort to Plaintiff.
- 45. Defendants' aforesaid actions caused direct and proximate injury and damages to the Plaintiff, including but not limited to pain and suffering, disfigurement, loss of enjoyment of life, emotional distress including the fear of imminent death, past and future medical expenses and general damages in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Honorable Court and in an amount to be determined at trial.

COUNT III

BREACH OF WARRANTY

Ms. Lindsley v. Honda

- 46. All allegations of the preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
- 47. Honda made certain warranties, both express and implied, with respect to the CR-V that was sold to Plaintiff.
- 48. By no later than April 5, 2013, Defendants determined that a safety related defect existed and decided to conduct a safety recall.
 - 49. Those warranties, both express and implied, were breached by Honda.
- 50. The CR-V, including its components and subassemblies, was neither merchantable nor fit for its intended use and, on the contrary, was defective and unreasonably dangerous due to the breach by Honda of the implied and express warranties of merchantability and fitness for use.
- 51. Defendants' aforesaid actions caused direct and proximate injury and damages to the Plaintiff, including but not limited to pain and suffering, disfigurement, loss of enjoyment of life, emotional distress including the fear of imminent death, past and future medical expenses and general damages in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Honorable Court and in an amount to be determined at trial.

COUNT IV

FAILURE TO WARN

Ms. Lindsley v. Defendants

- 52. All allegations of the preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
- 53. The CR-V was inherently dangerous and defective in that it placed Plaintiff in imminent danger.
- 54. Defendants knew or should have known that the CR-V was defective and unsafe, and it was the duty of Defendants to warn and notify Plaintiff of said dangers including but not limited to warning Plaintiff that it was unsafe to drive the CR-V until the defect was remedied. This, the Defendants wholly failed to do.
- 55. Defendants' aforesaid actions caused direct and proximate injury and damages to the Plaintiff, including but not limited to pain and suffering, disfigurement, loss of enjoyment of life, emotional distress including the fear of imminent death, past and future medical expenses and general damages in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Honorable Court and in an amount to be determined at trial.

COUNT V

VIOLATION OF THE PENNSYLVANIA UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES AND CONSUMER PROTECTION LAW (73 P.S. §§ 201-1 et seq.)

- 56. All allegations of the preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
- 57. Plaintiff is a person as defined by the Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law ("UTPCPL"), 73 P.S. § 201-1(2).

- 58. By selling the defective CR-V to Plaintiff, the Defendants engaged in an unfair and deceptive act or practice as defined by the UTPCPL.
- 59. More specifically, the Defendants violated the UTPCPL by representing that the CR-V was, *inter alia*, safe for its intended purpose, was consistent with the reputation for safety that a reasonable consumer would presume existed in a car manufactured by Honda, had the safety characteristics and features consistent those exposed and advertised by Honda, and would otherwise comply with federal law when it was not all in violation of 73 P.S. § 201-2(4)(v), (vii) and (xxi).
- 60. Plaintiff relied on Defendants' representations as to the safety and reliability of the CR-V when she purchased the vehicle.
- 61. Defendants' aforesaid actions caused direct and proximate injury and damages to the Plaintiff, including but not limited to pain and suffering, disfigurement, loss of enjoyment of life, emotional distress including the fear of imminent death, past and future medical expenses and general damages in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Honorable Court and in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 62. As a direct and proximate result of the violation of the Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law, Plaintiff is entitled to a judgment against Defendants for three times the actual damages, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, and any other relief deemed necessary and proper pursuant to 73 P.S. § 201-9.2.

COUNT V

NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

- 63. All allegations of the preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
- 64. When Lindsley saw the left front wheel of the CR-V rolling toward her head after it had rolled over her left leg, she was in imminent fear of the wheel rolling across her head and killing her instantly.
- 65. Lindsley suffered shock and distress as a direct result of the physical injury suffered, as well as the reasonable fear that her head was going to be crushed resulting in her instant death.
- 66. The Defendants had a contractual and/or fiduciary duty to Lindsley to ensure that the CR-V was safe for its intended purpose and would not cause injury to her.
- 67. Lindsley is entitled to compensation for her shock and distress arising from her fear that she would be killed by the negligent actions of the Defendants.
- 68. Defendants' aforesaid actions caused direct and proximate injury and damages to the Plaintiff, including but not limited to emotional distress including the fear of imminent death, compensable in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Honorable Court and in an amount to be determined at trial.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief against Defendants, jointly and severally, for all damages suffered, including but not limited to pain and suffering, disfigurement, loss of enjoyment of life, emotional distress including the fear of imminent death, past and future medical expenses and general damages in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Honorable Court and in an amount to be determined at trial, plus punitive damages and attorneys' fees and cost, and such other and further relief as the Court deems just and all other damages to the fullest extent provided by Pennsylvania law.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all causes of action so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

GOWEN RHOADES WINOGRAD & SILVA, PLLC

Dated: April 19, 2016

MARK L. RHOADES, ESQUIRE ATTORNEY I.D. NO: 80641

1420 Walnut Street

Suite 1320

Philadelphia, PA 19102

Phone: 215-496-9002 Fax: 202-499-1370

mrhoades@gowenrhoades.com

Attorney for Plaintiff, Margaret Lindsley

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Complaint was served upon the following on April 19, 2016, through electronic mail:

Tiffany M. Alexander, Esquire Campbell Campbell Edwards & Conroy 1205 Westlakes Drive Suite 330 Berwyn, PA 19312

Mark L. Rhoades, Esq.

Attorney for Plaintiff